DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 991 SO 009 308

AUTHOR	Whalum, Wendell; Day, David
TITLE	Why Sing? A Conversation about Music.
INSTITUTION	National Humanities Faculty, Concord, Mass.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	34p.; For related documents, see ED 085 753, ED 085 762, and SO 009 304-308 and 353
AVAILABLE FROM	Chandler and Sharp Publishers, 5608 Paradise Drive, Corte Madera, California 94925 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Creativity; Cultural Awareness; Educational Needs; Humanism; *Humanistic Education; *Humanities; Interviews; Music; Music Activities; *Music Education; Resource Materials; Secondary Education; Teacher Role; Teaching Methods; *Values

ABSTRACT

This publication relates a conversation between a university music professor and a public school music coordinator about musical creativity and its potential in every human being. As part of the National Humanities Faculty Why Series, the book is intended to help students, teachers, and citizens maintain and improve their intellectual vigor and human awareness and to help them reflect on the purpose, methods, and usefulness of a wide range of human endeavors. The major theme of the conversation evolves from four main areas of concern. First, assessment and reassessment, or discoveries and rediscoveries, of musical values are important. How do people determine what is valuable? Is it fair to make value judgments? Second, the interview is concerned with an approach to teaching and the teacher as a learner. How does the teacher encourage creativity? A third significant matter is the thread that ties all men together--humanness. Fourth, the significance of creativity is reiterated throughout the conversation. The need for music educators to make themselves open to new ways of learning and teaching music is stressed. A bibliographical note that cites resource materials of interest to music teachers and students is included. (Author/RM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125991

WHY SING?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A CONVERSATION ABOUT MUSIC WITH
WENDELL WHALUM CONDUCTED BY DAVID DAY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G.D. Rosenblatt

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

SP 009 308

The National Humanities Faculty Why Series

2

TITLES IN THIS SERIES

Why Talk?	Walter J. Ong and Wayne Altree
Why Read & Write?	Harry Berger, Jr., and Louis E. Haga
Why Re-Create?	Burton Raffel and Vincent J. Cleary
Why Pop?	John Cawelti and Don F. Rogerson
Why Remember?	Erich Gruen and Roger O'Connor
Why Belong?	James Peacock and Carol Ball Ryan
Why Judge?	William J. Bennett and William L. Bennett
Why Pretend?	Errol Hill and Peter Greer
Why Draw?	Donald L. Weismann and Joseph F. Wheeler
Why Move?	Bella Lewitzky and Yvonne McClung
Why Sing?	Wendell Whalum and David Day
Why Choose?	Harry F. Booth and Ronald W. Miller
Why Reason?	Edwin J. Delattre and Thomas J. Donovan

Foreword to the Series

This conversation bears a simple title: *Why Sing?* Yet taken together, this and the other conversations in this series illuminate one overriding question: What does it mean to be human?

Of course there are no final answers to that question, yet there are hard-won understandings and insights available to us from many sources, past and present. We all too often fail even to ask the question. Thus we ignore the help available and fail to become more human, more compassionate, more decent than we are.

At a time when our problems are so many – racism, poverty, pollution, crime, overpopulation, to name a few – we hold that all who care about education are compelled to reexamine what is taught and why. We believe that the problems will not be solved without getting at the larger question underneath them: What does it mean to be human?

The NHF WHY SERIES, then, reflects the concern of the National Humanities Faculty for the full range of humanistic questions. These questions involve but are not limited to the subjects in the curriculum that traditionally comprise the humanities: English, social studies, music, art, and the like. Indeed, they embrace the purpose of education itself.

In this series, the titles range from *Why Belong?* (human culture) and *Why Remember?* (history) to *Why Pretend?* (drama) and *Why Move?* (dance). Each presents a transcribed conversation between two people – one an authority in the study or practice of a particular branch of the humanities, the other a person experienced in the hard realities of today's schools. In these informal yet searching dialogues, the conversationalists are rooting out fundamental questions and equally fundamental answers not often shared with students of any age. They are the vital but often unspoken assumptions of the delicate tapestry we call civilization.

These conversations are designed for the learner who inhabits us all – not only the student but the teacher, administrator, parent, and concerned layman. We hope they will offer new insights into our inescapable humanity.

A. D. Richardson, III
Director
National Humanities Faculty

THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES FACULTY WHY SERIES

WHY SING?

a conversation about music with

Wendell Whalum

conducted by

David Day

Chandler & Sharp Publishers, Inc.
San Francisco

6

About The National Humanities Faculty

The NHF provides outstanding humanists from the world of the humanities, arts, and sciences as consultants to schools. The program was founded by Phi Beta Kappa, the American Council on Education, and the American Council of Learned Societies under grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities (although the findings, conclusions, etc., do not necessarily represent the view of the Endowment) and various independent foundations. Inquiries are invited: The National Humanities Faculty, 1266 Main Street, Concord, Massachusetts 01742.

© Copyright 1975 by The National Humanities Faculty
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 75-22971
Printed in the United States of America

Introduction to the Conversation

Why Sing, an interview between David Day and Wendell Whalum, involves more than merely singing. The whole idea of musical creativity and its potential in every human being is discussed in this penetrating conversation. The theme evolves out of four main areas of concern. First of all, assessment and reassessment or discoveries and rediscoveries of our musical values is important. How do we determine what is valuable? Is it fair to make value judgements? Secondly, Professor Whalum is concerned with an approach to teaching and the teacher as a learner. How does the teacher promulgate creativity? Another significant matter is the thread that ties all men together – humanness. This is a quality that transcends cultural bias and evokes a sense of understanding among humankind. Fourthly, the significance of creativity is reiterated throughout this conversation.

It is apparent that Professor Whalum has considered where we are in historical terms. In the nineteenth century, Ralph Waldo Emerson recognized that Americans had listened too long to the muses of European music. Many of us still listen to these muses and fail to realize that today, as in previous eras, European music is clearly the product of multimusical cultures.

Some primitive societies sang in monotone or two tone patterns and have now moved to very complex scale formations. These systems have had an impact on art music throughout the world. American music, like the population, is certainly the result of these many cultures.

Cultures, then, must be considered learning centers, and we must not be hesitant to learn from them. A pygmy mother will nurse or feed any child within the tribal tradition. Is there a message for our society in this practice? Southwestern Indians believed it was more important to steal the horse of your enemy and thus destroy mobility rather than kill your opponent. Is there a message in this practice for our society? Mr. Whalum believes there is a musical message in all cultures.

The goal of music, a microcosm of social communication, can be used to foster relationships between cultures. The extension of self-expression is most important. The process should begin with the youngest student. Traditionally, we have started with "Middle C" and not with musical sound. This pattern is comparable to having a painter paint a leaf before he sees the whole forest. The process must be reversed. Music educators need to open themselves to new ways of learning and teaching music. Traditions in teaching will have to be re-examined and administrators and school boards will also have to learn new ways of evaluating or assessing what a child has learned.

Professor Whalum provides the impetus for us all to look at the common experience of humankind, develop keen powers of observation, and the natural instincts within each of us for creativity. Perhaps, we can find once again a "joy" in singing and a rediscovery of human potential.

David Day, who is Special Projects Coordinator for Maine School Administrative District 3, plays the piano for his own – and others' – pleasure. Wendell Whalum is Fuller E. Callaway Professor of Music in Morehouse College, a specialist in Afro-American music, and the organist in his Atlanta church.

Tufts University — T. J. Anderson

WHY SING?

DAY Wendell, I have four children, scattered along the spectrum, various ages, who love to make music of one sort or another. They like to sing, along with others or with radio or television, and they pluck away at instruments. They're good, bad, and indifferent. None of them is a serious scholar of music, at least at this point. I'm also in the public schools, as an educator, and it bothers me that there doesn't seem to be the same joy of making music there that I find informally around me with my own children and some others. I don't know what happens, and I know I'd be oversimplifying if I said that it always happens, but too often the joy seems to go out of it in school. Is this your experience, or am I off on a little island by myself?

WHALUM No, I know what you're talking about, even though our experiences are in two regions separated by many, many miles. I find only a few students nowadays really coming to college with that general freedom of making music, making poetry, making anything from that living essence, that urge inside to express oneself. Frankly, I think this kind of expression is missing not just in the schools but in most homes. Years ago, before other forces were weighing so heavily on our experiences in life, we found the home just the place where we could create, where we could sing together. After supper was a favorite time in many homes, but nowadays that's not so. I think the basic urge to express, or to create, is essential and has to be fostered if we are ever going to have a real awareness of music in the adult life style of our communities.

In my own family, there were four boys and a girl, and my mother and father were both very musical. My father was a singer, my mother a keyboard person. The five of us thought we had one of the grandest times when, usually on Friday evenings after supper, we'd sing the great hymns of the church or the folk songs or the spirituals of the black experience as it was for us –

having a grand time and not knowing that we were really picking up a wealth of material that would serve us in the future. Later, in my particular case when researching Afro-American music, I was shocked to find that most of the things I was uncovering I already knew. And they came from those days around the home when there was love and a kind of urging, an encouragement, to create.

Well, move that into the school, and it's very disappointing. We don't have a blueprint for creativity. For the child whose parents may not really know that this is important, we don't have a way yet. We can say to the parents, "Let your child create" or "Encourage your child to create," but right away the situation becomes structured, because they say, "Well, how does one?" If you impose yourself on that child and on that parent, you are immediately placing a restriction on creativity. I think that the present generation shows us less and less of freedom with the arts, less creativity than we've ever had, if we look over the whole of civilization.

DAY "Creativity" can be a rather frightening word. Some people think of creativity as Beethoven or Bach doing marvelous things with themes, varying the themes and using different instruments. You're talking about creativity in a much simpler sense than many people would, aren't you?

WHALUM Yes, and undoubtedly the best way to define what I mean, musically, would be "making music." I mean just making music.

I earn my living in music, but not in jazz – that's not my speciality, though I can sit down at the piano and improvise for my own enjoyment and for the enjoyment of others. But look at my brother, who majored in social science and can do that same thing. He's been active in jazz in a local way around St. Louis. He's held onto his music, he makes music, and that's the joy of it. Look at the folk traditions across the world. There we're not talking about "creativity" in the hard sense of that word, but about making music, really.

During my first trip to West Africa, I'll never forget, I saw and understood the difference between the African concepts of making music and ours – what your kids do – what I do. When an African child is given an instrument, maybe a native instrument as old as the civilization, he's not taught the technique or skill. He's just given an instrument to become familiar with. Now, if it's a thumb piano, for example, he may take his hand and smack it or hit it hard. This is fine because it's his way of realizing that this instrument is an extension of himself. Maybe later on he will work around and find out that it makes many various tones – it may make him think of a song, it may make him think of a pattern. This is true even with a drum; when he strikes it, he gets, right away, a feeling of an extension of himself. So there again: making

music, making the instrument do what you feel. That's really what a lot of kids are doing now – they're using their guitars this way – I think it's marvelous – without knowing a thing about the guitar. They just sit, work out an approach, and then strum for their own delight.

DAY And then they get to the point where others are making music around about them, and they enter into the adventure of making music together. Not perhaps in a very highly structured a way, but with a feeling of I've learned of how to extend myself through music and now I'm learning how to cooperate with others in music.

But we've already agreed that somehow this fostering of something from within, this making of music, is something that the home often doesn't do very well. And we've said that it's pretty difficult for the school to take over for the home if the home hasn't done it. But how can the school, despite the difficulty, help the home and community rekindle this creative kind of making of music? Do you see any way this can be done?

WHALUM Yes, I think there are a number of ways. Recently, for example, in a high school in Nashville, Tennessee, the drama department was doing a play and trying to make it as authentic as possible. It was beautiful to see that the drama teacher had encouraged the students to look in magazines and in design books and to make the costumes themselves; the wardrobe was restricted to a few little items, but they had created them. Now I saw immediately a chance for the school to have helped with music. I think it would have been ideal if the school had just furnished four or five kids with, let's say, recorders. A recorder is a rather easy instrument to pick up and play, and it's usually attractive to those who are brought to it. The students could have been encouraged to look at the rehearsals of this drama and come up with a musical concept that would not necessarily be used along with the drama, but perhaps as a prelude to it, as an interlude, or a postlude to it. This would have involved more kids in the creativity. Then they – and others, maybe – would be less timid about trying a recorder in school or at home.

The school could so easily help the home and itself by erasing, or even blurring just a bit, the overly structured set up of ensembles and choruses and allowing, encouraging, students to realize music within the totality of education. Music shouldn't be happening over in the band room or the choral room, and no place else. They can't take the band or the chorus home with them.

Just a month or two ago, in Kingston, Jamaica, I saw an interesting experiment. Ouida Hilton-Tomlinson, who is in the office of education there, brought with her to a workshop for teachers material out of which instruments could be made. She left nothing out, but she didn't say, "This instru-

ment will be made by using certain dimensions on this wood and cutting on this line. These strings will have to be cut just so short" – none of that. She just furnished the raw materials and then had a few examples of instruments that had come from those kinds of materials. Now these were teachers. They made instruments over a three-day period, and at the end they played them. And they took them home. When the child becomes involved in the creating, in the making, of his instrument, it becomes a part of him, and he will take it home. Though at first an attempt may be made to dismiss it on the basis of noise and interference, I think in time the child will become the defender of this instrument and thereby help the total picture of music in the home and in the school.

In another school I've noticed a great deal of singing without concerts in mind, just singing for the room in which it's taking place. Do you know what happened? The children themselves decided to sing in the mall of the shopping center at Christmas. It wasn't a structured chorus – there were no sopranos, altos, tenors, and basses as we would teach them. But little by little the children made themselves into a group that defined itself by a spirit of being involved. Now, that went to the homes, and the parents supported it. (I understand that the PTA of that area *really* supported it after a bit.) They were happy to see the children trying this kind of experiment and happy to encourage them to try writing a little piece of music or a bit of poetry that could be set to music by another child in the class for everybody to sing. Not too alarming because of course you don't have to worry about it; once it's done, it's over, except that when it was good, the students themselves insisted on singing it again. In the end the children would have a finished product of their own making.

Now this isn't terrifically different from what happened back in the old days of history, and here we can find history being very kind and providing us with precedents. In the days before so much music publication and emphasis on publication, people got together and made music for the sheer joy of making music. We still have a whole lot of their stuff. Madrigals and motets, all that, grew right out of there, but they started first with the hearts and the heads of the participants. Of course that's the folk tradition as well.

DAY All right, but take a high school today, and suppose there's a music teacher and perhaps someone from social studies and another from science and maybe one from vocational arts who say, "Let's get some of the kids together, and make music. We'll sing, we'll make some instruments and play them – just kind of create together." Then a school board member comes walking down the hall and hears this and sees a kind of confusion. Nothing

seems to be terribly ordered or conventional, and he tries to find out what's going on. Someone makes an effort to explain it, and his response is, "Yeah, . . . I'll admit that everybody seems to be having fun, but it doesn't seem to me they're learning anything." How do you defend yourself against this kind of objection?

WHALUM Well, that's difficult. I think, though, that the defense is what happens with students themselves, given enough time. Anything that involves the creative process on this very elementary level will at the beginning be looked at dubiously by many, but if it's followed through and if there's a genuine interest, a keen interest from the teachers as well as the students, in time you get the proof.

You know, some people may be reluctant to admit it, but certain freedoms must be allowed in the creative process. First of all, the element of time is out. We must not put the students in a room over to the side and say, "All right, now you have three hours to be creative, and when we come back, we want to know what you've done." That's absurd. We know that time is important, we know that the school day is only so long – the school experience is only so long – but within it, we want to work at these projects. Out of that time can come a kind of spiritual content. What does music do anyway, for people? Musicians hope that the audience will like it, but that isn't really all that music is about. We hope that this experience will have something rewarding in it. If the students come up with much less than we went in there hoping for, but we get something, then we haven't failed.

I try to defend this kind of experience on the basis of "let's watch, and we might be pulled into it ourselves." This frequently happens. Then, I'd point out that I haven't forced people into it. I've let them come on their own. I tried to make it attractive because I think there's a need for this kind of thing. With all the printed music there is, with all the recorded music we have, we do not have all the music. And some of the best and most meaningful music for people is the music they make themselves. My own defense of a "making music" room like this is that in our schools today, the whole business is too structured. I think that we just have to be ready to make the gamble, take the chance, of allowing, with guidance, with concern, students to express themselves.

In my time there was this awful bit in the schools about jazz and jazz playing. I can remember back in elementary school and in high school and in college anybody who played jazz was put down – anybody who had a lot of jazz records was put down. But this wasn't realistic and shouldn't have happened. I remember some very fine budding jazz performers who got nipped in

the bud because they weren't allowed that freedom of expressing what was really in them. Now granted, they had heard records – granted they were patterning that early approach after somebody else; the fact still remains that if the school had left them alone long enough and encouraged them, they might have taken what was and made it into something we still don't have – we have no way of knowing. I remember this kind of thing turning people away from the whole educational process. One very fine pianist from Detroit quit college, he put down everything a degree program could offer, because they wouldn't let him play jazz in the practice room of the college. He still plays jazz in his home community, but he plays it with an apology, and he speaks as though, "Well, if I had stayed, well, if . . ."

All this comes in when you're defending "making music." Unfortunately, we tend to take to our teaching positions the worst of the kinds of things that were weighted on us when we were students. Somebody says, "Well, I believe in being creative," and he's saying that on top of knowing that in some instances he wasn't allowed to be too creative. Maybe at home he was, but when he got to school, he did it this way or no way. This defense is a very difficult one because it means proving to school administrators, school faculty, and in some instances to parents that it's still worthwhile to let human beings express themselves – freely.

DAY Now let me make that wandering school board member ask, "Well, this creativity thing is fine, but we still have only so much time in a school day. If we just let these kids and teachers and whoever else experiment and discover and play and make music, when are they ever going to have time, given all of the other things that they have to learn, to learn about Bach and Beethoven and Brahms?"

Do you think that if young people get a taste of making music, accepting themselves musically, and find it satisfying, kind of exciting, they're going to be – at least many of them are going to be – quite naturally led into wanting to learn more about how other people make music and have made music? Will they begin exploring some of the things that we try to inflict on them as a discipline of studies, but do it as people who have got the taste – the fever – rather than as slaves to the more academic and structured approach?

WHALUM Don't forget that the Swingle Singers taught more Bach to more people in a little while than all the music teachers that I know of and that you know of put together. They had students, children, young people, college people, grown-ups running around singing, with syllables, inventions and fugues and preludes and all the rest. The Swingle Singers did that. Switched-on-Bach – the synthesized stuff – has made a great contribution, but recog-

nize that it comes from something that the students already like. This is no academic approach, but it worked because a real live experience had attraction for them.

Then there's another, more significant, way of looking at it that's not "scholarly" in the conventional sense. I've run into many musicologists and music historians who believe that Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Mozart, the rest, can find an audience if the audience can find the men. They mean by that anchoring Bach to the life experiences and desires of the listeners, making him a living, breathing human being, not a disembodied "Oh, we're going to hear Bach."

Give them a good account of Bach as a man. Let me give you just a couple of the examples that I've used. Bach was no saint. He and one of his students had a fight in Leipzig, and Hans David and Arthur Mendel, in the *Bach Reader*, give a good account. Bach was coming down the street with a young lady – probably a student or a cousin – and a student whom he had scolded in the class that morning at the church threw a rock from the field where he and some friends were playing ball. Bach excused himself from the young lady, went over to the field, and had a little fight with this student, calling the boy a "nanny goat bassoonist." Well now, I go from that not to a chorale prelude but to Bach's delightful little poem, "Edifying Thoughts of a Tabacco Smoker" – the one about when he smoked his pipe. When you make Bach human, your students get a chance to realize he's not really different, he's not a saint; he was a man who had this need to express himself strongly, and who did so.

Brahms didn't like to travel very much on boats, he'd read that he might get sick, and so he wrote many letters to somebody telling him why he couldn't come to England, maybe for an honorary degree or to hear one of his compositions. The point is that "long-haired Brahms" was a human being and had do's and don't's and likes and dislikes, just as students do.

Let your students know that music is made by human beings, open them up to making music themselves, and then, I think, another man's music will be heard as an outgrowth of that man's experiencing the need to express himself. If students understand from the beginning what it is to put yourself into the art, what it is to express yourself as *you* feel in the art, they will appreciate Bach more. If they have to work with the process of creativity as Bach did, and if they recognize Bach as a fellow human being, then and only then will music cease at the early level to be a bear they're afraid of. This approach is good for teachers, too, especially those untrained in the strict discipline of music, say the social studies teacher who has to teach a course in music, or

the humanities teacher who wants to include music in his course. I think they will feel a lot better about music history when these human qualities are allowed to shine through and the student is able to anchor music in his own life, realizing that every individual expresses himself in some way. Then Bach and Mozart and Brahms can come along – not too many of them, just enough to provide examples of how former cultures have contributed to our own – as something meaningful and appreciated, not just "music history."

DAY I find that many young people, certainly beginning in junior high, and probably even before, seem to feel that education, the school, wants them to appreciate something that is labeled "good music," while the music of their youth subculture, what they call "our music," is labeled "bad music." Today, this is rock. I suppose (but like the jazz you were talking about earlier). Do you see this as any kind of problem in the schools?

WHALUM It's not only a problem now, it has been a problem. This value business has ruined us and put us in the awful state of affairs, musically, that we're in now, and it's on every level I know of. It's been handed down from previous generations, and even teachers of music themselves feel this way. I remember as a child being told, "Now we're going to go to the symphony concert" – this would be a teacher – "and you'll hear some fine music," which is the same as "good music." "We'll go to the opera and hear some fine music." All without realizing what that did to me. As I grew up and started my teaching days, I found myself separating symphonies from folk idiom, and I separated operas from folk tunes. Later, of course, I found out that if I'd done a little research, I'd have discovered that folk music is the basis of many of the favorite operas, and that would have helped my kids to appreciate a lot faster, too. I have students now who no longer have that uptightness and are able to realize that Hindemith based his third organ sonata on a little German folk song from the fifteenth century. And look at the folk music included in Vaughan Williams and Britten, among others. When you begin to deal with music that way, you have to soften the judgment of good and bad as it has been applied, especially, to the music of America.

There was a social judgment here, as well as a musical value judgment. To think that people who sang the blues were bad people is to deny us access to the blues. Well, you know Duke Ellington went through all this, and yet, at his death, he was hailed as one of America's greatest composers – a title he certainly did not enjoy in his early and middle years. I remember the times when to call Duke Ellington a composer would have meant you didn't know what a composer was. Now, *The New York Times* can call him one of America's greatest composers of all times. If Louis Armstrong, whose funeral I

certainly don't feel that I have any ability to lead children into making music because I don't feel I can do this myself. Don't we have a problem there?

WHALUM We do have a problem. We have a serious problem there, but not an insurmountable one. Until such teachers can get themselves feeling more comfortable, they can rely with perfect justification on the secondary sources. They can, as you say, go to books – and find the story about Bach and the "nanny goat bassoonist," for example. That gives them a start. But even more important is the recording industry. Though we know of it, it's not used as much as a secondary source as it could be for dispelling some of their fears.

First, though, I think you have to meet their fear with the idea that you don't have to know music: this is not a teaching class in music, this is to be an exposition class in the fine arts; this is an excursion in music, in listening, and into the humanities. Then emphasize the fact that the teacher can support the music with those sources that contributed to the climate out of which the music was created, and those he does know something about. Let's take the twentieth century; teachers really do run from twentieth-century music. But they might know a good deal about their own century otherwise. Even their high school students know something about it. I think it would be most rewarding for a teacher to sit down and think about the arts of his time – what the architecture describes, what the art, like drawings, paintings, and sculpture, reflect, what the poetry reveals, and don't neglect the novels. Put music in as another component of the fine arts. Think, for example, of the Stravinsky era, which begins in nineteenth-century Russia, moves into twentieth-century France, and then comes into America. Listen to the music: the "Firebird" suite, from 1910; "L'Histoire du Soldat," from 1918, "In Memoriam Dylan Thomas," from 1954; and more. Hear his language and get more meaning for the times in which he lived. It's no strange wonder that composers, for a long time, sought to know the Stravinskian style. Well, that's being specialized. But noncomposers were attracted to the fact that he was reflecting in his music the shifts in a position of philosophy, a position of social significance. The man was part of the civilization in which he was living.

These teachers really know music well when they're in a classroom in social studies (in any of the other disciplines actually) in the sense of being able to see how it relates to the age in which it lived. Take Baroque music, with its heavy ornamentation. It's immediately apparent as a part of the architectural design of the period. And then, when you erase all the ornaments, you see the music straightening out into a clearer form for symphonic use, and this is the Classical period. Then there comes the Victorian age, a stuffy period, and the music, well . . .

So the teacher who doesn't know music really doesn't have an excuse, if the music is pulled in, not to teach notes – that's specialized – not to teach how to write a motet – that's specialized – but because it's a part of this business called life, and really it's just another of the expressions of life. We can't let them off the hook that easily. I don't offer it as a simple approach. I just simply say that when teachers do their homework, and go far enough into it, listen to enough records and attend concerts and recitals, they'll find that music is not apart, it's not separate, it's in it, and once pulled back into focus, it will serve, as art and poetry do, to give more meaning and more depth to the experiences they're trying to create for their students.

DAY Then you think teachers don't need to be afraid of appearing to be ignorant before their students? They can invite the students to listen to or be aware of this music with them, explore this new thing together, without ever being put in the position of an authority or having to make profound statements about the music. All they need is an attitude of "Let's see if we can look at this music and the times out of which it came and come to our own conclusions about it."

WHALUM Yes, I think that's really the approach. It seems to me that we've begun to realize that the effectiveness of the teacher is dependent on the effectiveness of the student and vice versa. If they both understand what learning is all about, insofar as any of us can, they know it's something that takes a great deal of effort from both sides of that desk. I think by and large we'd discover that the most effective teachers are teachers who have stopped thinking about "what they will think of me." Actually, it's easier to say to a student, "I don't know, but let's find out." The student appreciates that human dimension in the teacher. And if the student comes up with the answer first, the teacher can then appreciate his dedication to learning.

I find it very good to run into obstacles, in class, that I cannot answer, and of course there are many. When the students realize that and hear that honest statement "I don't know," I think something happens to them and brings them into this searching, critically important arena of the learning experience. What we come out with is then something quite great. I know this happens in conducting choral works that haven't been recorded, when I work from the original manuscript, for example. Ulysses Kay, T. J. Anderson, Gordon Binkerd, Frederick Tillis, Gerhard Kraph, outstanding American composers, have written for the Morehouse Glee Club, my group, and of course none of these was recorded. (I must say that's good, because nobody should learn a score from a recording, if he's specializing.)

It helps my relationship to my chorus when they discover that I have to do

attended and played for, had known as a young man and as a middle-aged man what was said over his corpse – that he was appreciated as a man who made a great contribution to music rather than one who made music that was not completely accepted as good music – what a lovely life he would have enjoyed. Scott Joplin, who died in 1917 after creating operas and taking ragtime to a height that really should have been respected even then, was made to feel that his offerings were on the lower side in quality and not worthy of acceptance. Now, in 1972 when we premiered his opera *Treemonisha* in Atlanta, everyone was full of praise. Gunther Schuller and his New England Conservatory group play Joplin in Boston. And since *The Sting* came out, everybody runs around humming Scott Joplin's "The Entertainer." Suddenly in the 1970's he's a good composer. Why?

But now to get back to your question. Who has the right to say that all Bach is good and all Joplin is bad? Who has that right? In a musical sense the right is nonexistent. Nobody, absolutely nobody, has a right to mix up social judgments and musical judgments. I have the feeling that hard rock, rhythm-and-blues, blues, jazz, all these forms that express people's feelings, have to be reckoned with by the academy. I think that until we do this, our educational process isn't as relevant as we would like to believe it is.

Education itself is going to continue to give problems to lower economic groups until certain freedoms are allowed in this regard. In this day of experimentation with bussing and so forth, it's all too often I hear teachers say, "Well, you know *those* kids who came from *that* school," which usually implies one on the other side of the tracks, "are creating all kinds of problems for us." "Why are they creating these problems for you?" And they say to me, "Well, they don't know fine music, and the mess that they know, we cannot have here." I always ask them, "How did you think you were going to go across the tracks and bring the child and leave his culture? His culture might have some of the answers to gaps in what we consider the greater culture. Very very easily it's discovered that sometimes when these kids come from across there, they bring a freedom of singing, a freedom of playing instruments, unknown in the more structured society. Now it may be because they were denied, it may be because they didn't have certain experiences, but the fact is, they make the music."

In one specific instance that I recall, I saw it. A little boy came in, a little Puerto Rican kid, and he took the drum sticks from a band member and just beat the drum as he felt. Lo and behold, by the end of the day, this top drummer had reached out into the school and found this little Puerto Rican kid, and behind closed doors said, "Teach me what you know." Then there's

the West African boy whose father is studying in this country. That boy is just adored in his high school because he can drum. The sale of bongos and congas has increased – parents buy them, and then kids don't know what to do with them. But this boy shows them how the drums were played in his culture in West Africa, and the other students love him to death. Why should the teachers deprive their other students of these experiences? Why not use them?

DAY In a sense, what we're trying to get away from is the nineteenth-century elitist attitude toward education in general, the feeling that education is class structured, socioeconomically determined, and that, as a result, we can pronounce "good" and "bad."

WHALUM That's right. We've got to move into the twentieth century in all sorts of ways. There's been as much rejection of the composer who speaks to the age in which we live as there's been rejection of jazz, rock, and all the rest. The twentieth-century composer hasn't much audience to play to. You see, in more ways than one, we've got hung up on the idea that the music of the nineteenth century is the end of the road, and we've just got to break away from it. It's damaging.

DAY Do you blame this partly on the schools?

WHALUM Yes, I certainly do. The schools aren't sensitive to change. They're tradition bound, very much as the church is tradition bound. The hymns are just hymns, and if they don't sound concordant and sweet, then they aren't good hymns. But the truth of the matter is that it's the school's place to introduce students to all of music, especially that which speaks of the age in which we live. Now whether we like electronic music ourselves is not the point. Whether we like aleatory music is not the point. The point is, in the teaching of music, we ought not to neglect them. And then we'll find that we're not teaching, say, music specialized to a specialized class; then we'll be teaching music to everybody on the basis of introduction, familiarity, exposition. Each one will make his choices. But it's our job to make sure we're fair in our offering.

DAY Well, let's agree that kids need to be encouraged to make music, need to be freed up to express themselves musically, and we agree that the schools have some responsibility to help. Then we get some teachers who accept these facts. Now, you're a professor of music, Wendell, and you can talk about offering these options. But what about these other teachers who say not so much that they don't have the information – they can get that out of books, and most teachers feel very comfortable getting information out of books – but they say the trouble is, I don't know how to make music myself, and I

my homework myself before we begin to rehearse. I remember one student asking, about a difficult composition written for us: "You can do that, can't you?" And I told him frankly, no; I have to come between this man who created and the audience who will hear, and, I said, in the middle I've got to teach you. But it would help me if two or three of you studied the manuscript while I study it, so that you might put me on guard for things that I might miss. It was marvelous! The exchange of ideas. One boy from Philadelphia came in and said, "Hey, this is rough. Could we have a discussion?" Really, you know, I think they were caught up with it as much as I. Now, this to me represents that bit of freedom that teachers can enjoy when they can say frankly, "I don't know."

DAY So you recommend that teachers take the plunge and risk saying openly, "This is worth doing, though I'm not sure how it's going to come out. But let's go at it together, students."

WHALUM That's right. Let me tell you about a young teacher I know. She's working with a group of college freshmen (which isn't so removed from high school) in a general humanities class, and she certainly hasn't had specialized training in all the areas they get into. But she has this willingness to explore, which gives her a key to learning that's a little different from the traditional approach.

She and her class haven't just read Greek tragedy; they've performed it for themselves to get another kind of feeling about it. They've read selections from some of the most difficult philosophers, and they also studied their life stories and realized the humanness in their life styles. After they had written their own poetry, she told me, "When I grade their poetry, I'm not able to say 'bad' or 'good' in the old sense, because I want to encourage them. In the margins I put a column headed 'Suggestions,' so my criticisms are based on my reading of what they've written, but not a total rejection of their creative effort." She says too that on the basis of that, most of those kids go ahead and rewrite and rewrite and rewrite that poem, and work on others.

Now, one of the things she and that class did was learn a Palestrina motet. In fact, that's how I got in on it; she called me in to hear this group, and I was knocked off my feet. Now, they weren't trying to sing, as technical singing goes; there was no mention of the great vocal approach or things that we would do in a specialized course – maybe we're wrong in doing them there, too. These were kids singing this Latin, this short three-part thing, and singing it with a sense of accomplishment. Do I need to tell you that she played recordings of Palestrina, of Ingegneri, of Vittoria, all new to these students? She took those same kids over to the Trappist monastery at vespers, to hear

the monks chanting Gregorian chants. They didn't do a great deal with definition, and she didn't come back and examine them on everything. But they loved what they did.

She wasn't trained in music. She, too, needed to know more about all these things. When they got to jazz, she recognized a bass player in the class and let him do a lecture, which was marvelous. She uncovered others in the class who were only listeners, never played a note, but who knew recordings, knew performers. They had definitions that they had made on their own, based on what they had been listening to, not always traditional, but showing they understood. For example, when Oscar Peterson, a pianist and composer, was improvising on a recording, one boy stood and said, "He's composing." By themselves they got to a discussion of what is a composer, and they began to look back on the fixed compositions they'd heard before. How about improvisation and the Baroque music and Bach we were talking about? How about Bach taking a simple chorale of the church and adorning it in the best ornamental style and offering it as a chorale prelude, or writing a cantata of big proportions based on a simple chorale of the church? And she said, "These are things that *they* offered, as their experiences continued to grow and grow and grow." When teachers remove that element of fear, I think everyone really is in better shape.

DAY Yes, I can see the approach working with a lot of teachers, but to come back to what we started with, "let's make music together," some teacher is still going to say, "But I just can't make music." Is it true that there are some people who just can't make music, or does this result from a misunderstanding of what it means to make music?

WHALUM I think the latter is the more correct. I think, again, that this is one of the problems that musicians, specialized musicians, have created in the school structure. I think everybody can make music. It may not sound the way we want it to sound, but that's something we've already mentioned.

I'm no painter in the sense of what I see hanging on the wall of a museum, but I enjoy dabbling sometimes. My little son does, too, and I encourage it, because this is what he feels, and I do mine because this is what I feel. There's a sense of accomplishment, there's a sense of relief to know that "Here's something that I tried; it speaks of me."

Now, if you've tried to sing, got some feel of it, and then know that you'd rather confine your singing to the shower, you've at least been exposed to good vocal stuff and you've enjoyed and entered into some of this yourself. If everyone had just the chance, is there any question about what the future of our audiences will be? You may say, "I don't want to go to that concert."

But you'll know why you don't want to go. I'm convinced that most students tell me they don't like fugues because they don't know fugues. Once they've found out what the fugue is, they do in fact, in many instances, like it. And if they don't like it, they know why, which still has something good in it for the classroom.

I think teachers could feel really relieved if they knew that they *can* make music, and that they should. Forget the singing, and make an instrument. I'm no good at that kind of creativity, but I try it every now and then. I'll rig up something, and I may enjoy it for a little while. Another thing it does is remind us that all the instruments that we take for granted were created at some time by somebody. Look at cultures older than ours, older than the European culture; you start seeing instruments that crudely resemble something that we take for granted. Making an instrument yourself helps strengthen the idea that music is just made by people, it's not miraculous, and you've nothing to fear.

DAY You think a teacher wouldn't be so frightened if she made a stringed instrument, with a cigar box and some fishing line, and plinked around, because she knows and everybody else knows that it's not supposed to sound like a Stradivarius?

WHALUM That's right. Take the old gut-bucket bass. In my childhood, whenever my father (not my mother because she was afraid of that section of Memphis), whenever my father had to go to his office and took me on the weekend, we'd probably see somebody playing a gut-bucket bass, an old tub for the hog entrails, carried upside down, and this player would stand there and play his bass. Well, I've seen Kentucky mountain people, white people, playing them, so I don't know whether the origin is black or white. But one thing I do know: it wasn't meant to sound like a manufactured double-string bass. It was meant to sound, for the function it was serving, just like it sounded.

In those days of the gut-bucket bass, I remember hearing B. B. King, who at that time had made it as far as Memphis, standing at the corner of Fourth and Beale, just above the strip that we know from the Handy era or the Fats Waller era, learning to play the guitar that now is his trademark. King knew no "music," he knew no theory, he cared less. He didn't even know the word "counterpoint" existed, but he kept at it and kept at it until here twenty or thirty years later he's known all over the country and over much of the world because he wasn't afraid to get into this.

Remember what I said earlier about the West Africans' giving a child the instrument and no technique? That's just the first step. When that child gets

older, he's instructed to go out and get the materials and make the instrument. Well, this is just another way of approaching the cigar-box thing, because when you're involved with that box and those strings, that's half of making it you. Well, when this child has to go out and find a certain tree, get a certain wood, there's an education going on there; cut it down, carry it, that's education there; dry it and preserve it, so that its resonance will be just what he wants, that's an education. He finally gets to the day of putting it together, no nails, no glue; fit it together with pegs, that's an education there. And then he has to get the guts of an animal, a specific one, if you please, and clean it, stretch it, dry it; little by little the strings are being brought into shape. Put them on. A miracle! That instrument's a part of him before he begins to play it.

Now, I really believe that's the kind of thing creativity has in it. And it's the kind of thing our overemphasis on the structured band, the structured orchestra, has ruled out. But it's still going on in some parts of the world, and we've got to realize its worth for our society.

Now, to come back to your earlier question of defending the making of music in the schools. It wouldn't be so hard, would it, to defend something like that? Even if the first try at making an instrument is a failure, the student has something to think about, to analyze. He can look at it and make another one, and another one, and another one, until finally he gets it to where he really loves it. I must say I wish that we could hurry up and get back to the making stage. You used to see kids making not just musical instruments but making games, making tunes to support games – rhythm skills being created without calling them rhythm skills – sometimes right in a vacant lot. But now we've got it all built in, structured, and I'm not sure it ought to be that way or wants to be that way.

DAY I was talking recently with a young woman who's working in the medium of painting -- she's very serious about this and spends hours and hours each day at it. Anyway, she said one of the biggest problems she's had to overcome is one of having preconceived ideas as to what she wants to have happen on the canvas, to the extent that these preconceived ideas spoil the experience for her. "Because it isn't coming out the way I planned it to, I find I'm not enjoying it, when really," she says, "if I could just forget these preconceived ideas – they're there, and they're always at work – but if I could just get beyond them, then I could enjoy what does happen." It's as though she were struggling to let her painting be the outward manifestation of some inward essence. Don't you think it would be good if we could reach the point where the same thing could happen in music?

WHALUM I really think that she's disturbed at a point she can't avoid. She just put it into words, which most people can't do. Think of talking to a composer who tells you that you too can compose. And do it without much special training. He is encouraging, and you begin to get your ideas together and come upon something and want to make a symphony of it. Immediately you're talking about something very special; you're talking about a form that's defined and well used. You sit down and what you thought was a symphony may come out to be about five measures. It didn't come out as a symphony, but as a melody. To specialize like this requires you to study the theory of music and composition and begin with the simple and move to the more difficult, gradually. It's hard, not easy, that's the agony of the creative process. Truly, to put that into words is hard, but it certainly says a lot. To realize what's in your head, to know that it's there, and then watch it as it develops in front of you is utterly fantastic. Preconceived ideas can often whip us down, but they often give that added spark for determination. The challenges of the creative process are just great.

DAY And it may be that if you don't let yourself be imprisoned by what you thought you wanted to make, you may find that what you have made -- maybe after you've gone over it and over it again -- that what you wind up with will be very satisfying to you if you don't insist on its being what you thought you started out to get.

WHALUM And it may turn out to suggest even more to you, because it is freeing itself from your mind, from your preconception. Now when you've finished it, if there's still a challenge here in your mind, deal with that too. But go on, keep moving forward, let it burst itself, if you will. And in the end you might discover that your creation was greater than you'd ever conceived. There's a piece of music created by the two men James Weldon Johnson and J. Rosemond Johnson (actually the words were written by James Weldon, who was a black graduate of Atlanta University in 1871, and the music by his brother, J. Rosemond, who studied in the New England Conservatory). The song called "Lift Every Voice and Sing," in time, came to be called the "Negro national anthem," because all Negroes knew it. The Johnsons were known later as writers of musical shows. They wrote this song for a Lincoln Day performance in Jacksonville, Florida, during the early years of this century. They were both young men then, but years later when they discovered that virtually every black person in this country knew "Lift Every Voice and Sing," James Weldon said, "You know, we wrote better than we knew." What they did was for a particular time, but they reached the sentiment of all people.

So you see this is what happens, I think, when you create. You don't care if anybody comes to the museum to see your painting. You hope they do. But that isn't the reason you've got to do this thing, it has become a part of you, and you put it down. And you may never see in my music what I see. I may never see in the poetry or in the painting what the creator did. But that's not the point. The creator's not trying to lock your mind. He's trying to help free your mind. Now you're dealing with something that came through him. After all his agony, this process of birthing something that's never been here before, he's giving you the outward manifestation of an inner living essence. What was in there has to come out, and he let it out. If it doesn't come out we're in trouble! It's all marvelous.

DAY It seems to me you're saying that everyone has this inner essence, and that at the school level there's no point probably in trying to make judgments about whether what one person has inside is any more valuable than what anyone else has. Instead, one of the tasks of the schools is to help youngsters manifest that essence in the way that is freest and best for them and encourage them. And we can feel some confidence that some of these people will go beyond this to a more disciplined approach to music, become more skilled performers and all the rest; this will take care of itself if we're really encouraging this creative process.

WHALUM Right. We've wrecked a lot of lives already, for maybe decade on decade, trying to put values where they didn't belong or need to be.

DAY Let's hope those days are coming to an end, and let's hope – let's *say* – that we have teachers and administrators who would like to see the school system become a place that's freer for creative expression, a place to develop a real love for and joy in music and the other arts. Now, if we are in a situation where we want to move in the direction we've been talking about, we really have very little money to try all kinds of fancy things, to buy all kinds of new things. How do we take some practical steps that lead us in these directions with a minimum outlay of money?

WHALUM Well, there are several approaches, but one comes to mind immediately because it's being used in some areas that I know of, and it has built in it another gain. Briefly, it's the involvement of the community in supporting the music program. In the simplest dimension, there's the purchase of recordings. We mentioned earlier their usefulness as source material. Certainly not all of them are overly expensive, and you don't need a ton of them to start the program. So people who are in some places linked under the title "Friends of Music" can at least take steps to help with providing recordings and the equipment to play them on if the school budget won't permit even

that. And sometimes friends who really are interested help bring in live performances, which the town or the community might attend and enjoy as well as the students. Also, I think this same type of group might be the proper patrons for encouraging the creativity of the children's group in the school. Think about youngsters knowing that some people outside the school care enough to provide, well, say those cigar boxes and fishing lines we've talked about.

Now there's another gain, as I said. I think we re-enter the school as a part of the community and not an entity separate from it. Someone has suggested that schools, all of them, now regard themselves more as ivory towers, apart from the marketplace. I think that we must realize that we're custodians of both, that we really are part of both. Nobody should say "out in the real world" when he's in the school; the school ought to be in the real world. We'll find that the people in the community are waiting and wanting to do the things that will help.

For example, there comes to mind a woman, the wife of a doctor, who had quite a music background. She doesn't call herself a finished musician, a professional musician, but she has a flair for classical music on the guitar. She was sitting in the music room in her little house almost every day, enjoying playing classical music on her guitar, and when this school let it be known that they wanted to do something different, she called a friend of hers and said, "With whom do I make contact?" So they brought her in and opened a new avenue for the students who were interested in music of the type that she was playing – and for some who hadn't known before that they were interested. So here was a model. And because she was a wife, a housewife, it was even easier for these kids to take her as someone who would be willing to help them, a nonprofessional like them. So I think that all kinds of possibilities are open.

DAY Then there are possibilities for bringing the community into the school as a resource. Do you also see possibilities for bringing the school, the children, out into the community, and using the community itself as a resource?

WHALUM Yes, and they're equally important. I think immediately of the church. The church has not in all respects fulfilled its role as a part of our life, our community existence, as it should have. Really, the church could provide an excellent outlet for the music of the school, not always in the worship service, but maybe in the social life of the church. And the church school can be encouraged to become involved in more creative or music-making processes.

By doing this, we really are publicizing, without calling it that, this whole

business of the new music program in the school. Then civic organizations would pick up the news. I've noticed in one or two communities more of this kind of music at Christmastime in the parks or in the shopping centers, where people who normally wouldn't go to the schools get a first-hand taste of what the schools are really doing. Give them a chance to form an opinion, and it's usually very good for helping to move the program on and on and on. They realize too that in time those children who are making the music are going to be out here in the community, and then of course your enrichment increases, and the value would, I think, increase as well. So get the school right back into the community. Though I don't really think I'd like the relationship to be understood any way but as a two-way street: the community goes to the school and the school comes to the community, both realizing that they belong to each other. With this working together, the whole problem of finance and budgeting and all the rest would be solved.

DAY When you're talking about, for example, youngsters singing in a shopping center at Christmas you wouldn't insist that those be chorus performances, you wouldn't rehearse the kids to death for them, you'd just have them go out and sing carols in a joyous way because they've been doing it in school and enjoying it? In the same sort of way in the old days there used to be carolers in a community, not trained musicians, just people who enjoyed going out and expressing Christmas spirit? I think sometimes the schools get all hung up, therefore the teachers get hung up, about not doing anything wrong. There's the feeling that when they're going to put on a concert or a play – it's not just music – and ask the community in, it ought to be just right. And so they rehearse the kids until they take all the fun out of it, the teachers are cross and cranky, and the spontaneity and the joy are lost.

WHALUM Yes, that's what I meant. One of the biggest thrills I ever had was years ago in Saint George's Church in Stuyvesant Square in New York City, where the congregation and the community were invited to come and decorate the church at Christmas. Now at first, you say, this is going to be a mess. Well, it was not. The result was beautiful in every way. It simply means that everybody takes a hand. They sing carols, they wrap presents that will go to orphan homes, and so forth. But the involvement doesn't call for a rehearsal at all, really: it calls for interest.

Yes, the one thing we're talking about here is music for everybody, and I hope that comes across. If you talk about singing the carols in the square or in the shopping area, and you talk about it in terms of a choir, then you're going to talk about an audience. What I was thinking was what you suggested: the involvement of the community. Let's sing the carols. But let's not sing

complicated arrangements, let's sing the carols, and then everybody can join in. And everybody will. They'll sing the very simple, unadorned "Silent Night" that almost everybody in almost every American city could sing. People might not mingle with you for long, but they sing as they go on. This doesn't mean they won't also go to the Christmas concert of the school chorus or the church choir and hear the arrangements, they will. It means that for a little while they themselves have been a part of it. And for a little while school and community have joined in the experience of music in their daily life style.

And the practice, we must remind ourselves, is not new. Older American cultures saw this. Look at what used to be true of the Fourth of July. Look back at what Charles Ives wrote, or go further back to what some of the earliest American composers, like William Billings, did. They set down their ideas of a real celebration on the Fourth of July, and the people in the town met for the patriotic songs that made them define again, one more time, the importance of that day. Music was used as the vehicle. Once you begin to arrange it, you immediately cut the audience off from being performers or participants. They just applaud when you finish. I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about the kind of thing that makes them join in "America the Beautiful," makes them join in "My Country, Tis of Thee." Because you're not arranging it, you're singing it, you're playing it, and they can do that.

What we're calling for is a return to the involvement of the people. So I think it will work. I think too, though, it will be rejected by some at first as being totally impractical, but you've just got to take that and keep after the goal, knowing that what we're going to do is finally involve that very objector.

DAY Having spent a fair amount of time talking about the importance of not making value judgments on different kinds of music, maybe we still have to meet head on the question that some people have: What value is there to music as such? What about the person who just shrugs his shoulders and says, "Well, music's all right for them that likes it, but it's really a side issue in life, and what's all the fuss about anyway?"

WHALUM Immediately, of course, I must say that you'll always have the type of person who feels himself outside the experience of music. And I myself wouldn't want to look at music outside the fine arts in general. What's the value of art? Nature certainly grows in anybody's mind when he uses it in a painting or knows how to look at one. There may be something in it that you didn't even see before. Maybe he finds something new in a poem. Robert Frost can do with words something that you wouldn't have paid any attention to otherwise, but when he finishes, the simple phrase is a part of you, you never forget it.

I think that music is a part of that. It's an expression, it's a reaction, it's a comment on so many things. It may be one thing considered in the dimension of jazz, but that's a part of our existence. It may be sacred, but that's another part. It may be the concert hall, but that's a part, too. Wherever you find it, music is a commentary on life. It may sometimes be used in a sense of fantasy, but it's often used in a sense of reality. I'm not sure that I can answer it any more directly than that. I just think that music is a heightened expression.

DAY To ask it differently, in what way are children going to be better off, and society better off, if they do have opportunities to express themselves creatively, musically, to make music, to learn to enjoy making music, to learn to appreciate the music that other people make?

WHALUM That's easier for me to answer. I think music helps to order a person's life. It brings him to participation with art. That's unity. If it's singing, group singing, it brings the principle of organization and strength even closer. I think, though, it has another dimension. A human being is better off in recognizing the joy of associating with other human beings and realizing the worth of such exposure. If he's properly taught, properly encouraged, he may not know all the history, but he will know that music just isn't something that's "out there," it's part of "in there," and it comes out, it comes out of him as he participates. That's it. That may be the greater value. He's better because he's able to recognize the beauty, the aesthetics. He's able to recognize the subjectivity and the creativity of his existence.

Bibliographical Note

Students and teachers attempting to understand music in the humanities have much good supportive literature available to them. Much of it, fortunately for the layman, uses the nontechnical approach and places strong emphasis on historical perspective. This approach makes it possible to realize music in culture as an active and important agent in both developed and underdeveloped civilizations. To do this both folk and composed music must be given consideration. This should not only be necessary; it should be expected. The result should begin to instruct the student in developing a system of analysis wherein he can move toward the ability to evaluate and judge music for himself.

Teachers will find two books very effective: Curt Sachs' *The Commonwealth of Art* and his *Our Musical Heritage*, both from W. W. Norton, are excellent sources to begin with. Of course there are other sources that might be considered as well. Wold and Cykler's *An Introduction to Music and Art* (William C. Brown Publishers) is a good source for course organization. *Music and the Culture of Man*, by Sharon Scholl and Sylvia White (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.); *Modern Culture and the Arts*, by James Hall and Barry Ulanov (McGraw-Hill Book Company); *A Pictorial History of Music*, by Paul Henry Lang and Otto Bettman (W. W. Norton) are all good sources to use in beginning and developing the general approach.

A recent trend in general music courses has developed from a growing recognition of musics from other lands. Music of Africa, especially West Africa, music of the black people in the United States, and music of the Caribbean are among those strongly admired. Research is well under way that will yield much literature from these areas in the not too distant future, I believe.

Professor J. H. Kwabena Nketia of the University of Ghana has completed monographs and is working on others that are of considerable significance in understanding the music of Africa. His *Papers in African Studies*, 3 (Legon:

Ghana Publishing Corporation, Institute of African Studies) and *Our Drums and Drummers,* from Ghana Publishing House, are excellent sources. Eileen Southern has issued two volumes, *Music of Black Americans* and *Readings in Black American Music* with W. W. Norton. Through her *Black Perspectives in Music,* a semiannual publication, Dr. Southern offers scholarly articles and comments.

Black Music of Two Worlds by John Storm Roberts (Praeger Publishers) is a very recent treatment of "Old Cultures in a New World," "Black Music of the Americas," and "The Music of Postcolonial Africa." In addition to these chapters Roberts includes a selected bibliography and a selected discography, which offer a broader look at each of the areas written about in the book.

As a final note I must underscore the danger involved in attempting to study music in humanities classes without relating it to other aspects of culture. Music comes alive for the layman and the professional when it is viewed within the cultural framework of which it speaks.

W.W.